

**DEC 12 2005**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**  
**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK**  
**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

JULIO LIMA MARROQUIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 03-72061

Agency No. A75-530-548

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 5, 2005\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, W. FLETCHER, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Julio Lima Marroquin, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' summary affirmance of an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of his applications for asylum and withholding

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review adverse credibility findings for substantial evidence, *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001), and we deny the petition.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility finding based on inconsistencies between petitioner's mother's application and her testimony as well as inconsistencies within his mother's testimony with regard to the content of the threatening notes, and the failure to provide easily available corroborating evidence. *See id.* at 1043-45; *see also Sidhu v. INS*, 220 F.3d 1085, 1092 (9th Cir. 2000) (stating that if the IJ has a reason to question the alien's credibility, and the alien fails to produce easily available corroborating evidence, then the adverse credibility finding will withstand appellate review).

Because petitioner failed to demonstrate that he is eligible for asylum, it follows that he did not satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

The voluntary departure period is stayed pursuant to *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741, 750 (9th Cir. 2004).

**PETITION DENIED.**